

New York Tribune.
First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorial—
Advertisements.
MONDAY, JULY 5, 1915.
Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a
New York corporation. Office: 100 N. York St., New York.
Subscription Rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside
of Greater New York.
Daily and Sunday, 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$5.50;
Daily and Sunday, 3 months, \$3.00; 1 month, \$1.00.
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos., 42¢; 3 mos., 22¢; 1 mo., 12¢.
Daily and Sunday, 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$5.50;
Daily and Sunday, 3 months, \$3.00; 1 month, \$1.00.
Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail
Matter.
You can purchase merchandise advertised
in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for
if dissatisfaction results in any case THE
TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money
back upon request. No red tape, no quib-
bling. We make good promptly if the adver-
tiser does not.

Independence Day, 1776-1915.

On the day when the whole nation is celebrating the Declaration of Independence, the final expression in words of the spirit and the soul of the American idea in history, it is fitting, it is appropriate, that Americans should consider what to them, to their history and to their ideals, the great conflict now raging in Europe means.

In the past two months, and even in the last three days, there has come to us another direct revelation of what the German spirit means. A whole nation stood recently horrified, saddened, beside the shore and saw in the waves the final resting place of some scores of its women and its children, massacred because they came between Germany and her purpose. On Saturday last an American citizen, in his own home, was attacked by another exponent of the German idea because in the proper and rightful exercise of his inalienable rights he, also, intervened between Germany and her desires.

Now, the Lusitania massacre and the attempted assassination of Morgan are by no means accidental or incidental circumstances. On the contrary, both are highly characteristic and truly illustrative of the German idea.

Go back over the years to the actual beginning of the modern Germany, the united Germany which owes its unity and its impulse to Prussia, and it will be recalled that Frederick the Great began his long career by tearing up that solemn pledge made to an Austrian sovereign and invading the Silesian province of a brave, beautiful, but unfortunate queen. He ended the work of his life by that first partition of Poland which was the beginning of more than a century of slavery for a people hitherto independent.

In the Nineteenth Century the foundations of the present German Empire were laid upon the conquest of Danish provinces, which included the subjugation and slavery of some thousands of Danes desirous of living and dying citizens of the Danish Kingdom. To ruin France the French nation was led into an ambush, into a war for which German rulers knew France was unprepared, by the "editing" of the Ems dispatch, the details of which were made known to the world many years after by the Bismarck memoirs. More than a million and a half of men and women who desired to remain French citizens were forcibly annexed, despite their protests, to gratify German ambition, to satisfy German desires.

As recently as 1909 it was German intervention in the Bosnian treaty which extinguished the hope of 2,000,000 Bosnian Serbs and seemed to condemn them to eternal slavery to alien races. Finally, within the year, the invasion of Belgium was a new demonstration of the spirit of Germany in its relation to the weak, the helpless, the unlucky nations who lie in the pathway of German purpose and are thus, in the German view of things, sentenced to death. To-day those who are in authority in Germany are freely declaring that Belgium must be annexed to repay Germany for her sacrifices in blood and treasure.

Now, whatever of admiration Germany commands and deserves for the great things she has accomplished, whatever of praise, of tribute, the American people pay to another race which in peace has known how to carry the organization of its population, the provision for its laborers, the administration of its cities, to a perfection unknown in human history, this admiration, these tributes, should not blind Americans to the thing that Germany now means in the world, to the consequences to mankind, to Americans as well as to Belgians, Serbs and Frenchmen, of the success of German arms in the present world war.

If Germany succeeds many millions of men, women and children will be prevented from the exercise of all those rights which the Declaration of Independence recapitulates. What the Poles of Posen have endured for a century will be the lot of the Belgians, Brabant, Liège, Flan-

ders, will know the martyrdom of Lorraine. In Austria and in the Balkans some millions of Slavs, Serbs, Czechs, Poles, of Greeks, of Italians, of Rumanians, will be condemned to a servile condition, deprived of the right to use the language of their own race, to exercise the rights which we in America bestow freely upon all men of every race of Europe that come to us and fulfill the formal conditions of our own laws.

In the world Germany, the Prussianized Germany which we know, has from the outset of its great history demonstrated its contempt, its utter lack of respect, for the word or the spirit of a treaty the moment the treaty has ceased to serve a German end. From Frederick the Great in the Silesian time to William the Second at the frontier of Belgium last August, Germany policy, German method, have been the same. Belgium is but the last of many victims; she in her turn has been sacrificed to the German determination to possess that "place in the sun" which satisfied German conception of the Teutonic sphere.

We shall do well in America to recognize the grandeur of that conception. We shall do well to appreciate the self-immolation, devotion, constancy, of the Germans to their ideal, to their idea. Human history has seen few, perhaps no example of national solidarity, of the complete fusion of a whole nation and of all classes of a people, comparable with that the German people are to-day giving the world. We shall do well to banish permanently the old, absurd notion that a minor fraction of the German people had been able to drive millions to war. We shall do well to recognize, to remember, the nobility, the tragic grandeur, of the German people in the great hour in which we now live.

But the frank and complete recognition of all this must not blind us to the other side. Again and again it is necessary to ask ourselves what the triumph of the German idea will mean to the world, to us, to our own idea, to the purpose which moved our ancestors to begin in this remote continent and amidst conditions which seemed beyond the control of man the experiment which is the United States of America. For let us recall at all times that if there is a German idea there is also an American idea, that if Germans are dying bravely, living splendidly, for a conception of their own race Americans over many generations have made the same sacrifices for their ideal of national greatness.

Now, to the American ideal the assault upon Belgium is utterly foreign. To carry fire and sword, murder and pillage into a peaceful nation, to resolve deliberately by instituting a reign of terror, a régime of slaughter, in a land whose neutrality was guaranteed and whose weakness made self-defence impossible, in order to crush national spirit—this can have but one effect upon a people whose history goes back to Concord and Lexington, whose liberty is due to a revolt against far less intolerable conditions than those Germany sought to impose on Belgium a year ago. The men of Concord and Lexington, under the German military law, were assassins. Louvain was a smaller offence than Lexington, yet neither the women nor the children of Middlesex County were compelled by British soldiers to pay for the patriotism of their husbands or fathers in shame or blood.

As for the Lusitania, the thing itself was so unthinkable, the crime against mankind so terrible, that after the passing of weeks it remains, as it will ever remain, a landmark in human infamy. Yet to the German idea it was an incident. German scholars, journals, statesmen find ready pollution in the fact that there was ammunition to be used against Germans on board the ship. And because of this American citizens, American women and children, were massacred. Because Belgian men and women were in the pathway of German conquest they were murdered.

Now, at last, in our own country a champion of the German cause undertakes to murder an American citizen. He, too, is an obstacle in the pathway of Germany. Therefore he must die. No question of law or right, no protection of American citizenship, nothing of all that we regard as guaranteed by civilization or nationality could protect him. Hence the pistol. To say that the assailant is insane is to say nothing. Is he more insane than the statesmen who ordered the massacre of the Lusitania? Is he more demented than the officers and soldiers who burned Louvain and made Aerschot a slaughter pen?

Is it not necessary to recognize that through all these things there runs the same spirit, the same essential unity? Germany is determined to impose her will upon the world. She was determined that Belgium should permit German troops to pass through its territory. She was determined that ammunition should not reach England, and to her the killing of American women and children was only a necessary incident to sinking the Lusitania.

Now one German sympathizer is determined that American ammunition must not go to the Allies, and he undertakes to murder Morgan to prevent it. Wherein is Holt less rational than von Tirpitz?

This, then, is what the German idea means to the world. This is what the German spirit means to the nations that have no part in the war and have no other desire than to live in accordance with those rules and laws which time and usage have established as the guides to international intercourse. No consideration of written word, of treaty, of pledge, no regard for the primary doctrines of humanity are to be permitted to stay the hand of a German statesman, a German soldier, a German sailor, even a German sympathizer, when there is a German end to be served by disregarding them.

Reread the Declaration of Independence, and what American can fail to perceive how far all this is from our own purpose, our own history, our own conceptions of humanity, of religion, of all that makes for "sweetness and light"? If this is to prevail in the world, if this spirit is to endure, Germany may not ultimately dominate the world, but her idea will. Europe, America, the whole of mankind, perceiving that only German methods succeed, will in self-defence and by infinite gradations descend to this level, to a barbarism of morals, unredeemed by a splendid civilization of machinery.

No American political party, no organized portion of the nation, desires to enter the Great War. In preserving our neutrality President Wilson has obeyed the will of the majority, the overwhelming majority, of his countrymen. But what percentage of Americans can desire German victory or seek to make us the ally of Germany and the abettor of her purposes? This is what the German sympathizers in this country are now trying to accomplish. They are endeavoring to have us abandon our neutrality, place an embargo upon the shipment of arms, close our own markets to Germany's enemies, that Germany, thanks to original advantages due to preparation, may conquer Europe.

Twice by attempted murder the German purpose has been indicated. To that end the dead of the Lusitania were scattered over the sea. To that end Mr. Morgan was to have been assassinated. Do we need further lessons in the real meaning of the German idea to awaken us to the real import to America of the struggle in Europe, or the value, the necessity to the United States that the present German civilization, or, rather, German denial of civilization, shall not prevail in a world in which for centuries without number men have been struggling to emerge from barbarism, from the barbarism to which Germany now has turned for inspiration, the barbarism that places its whole reliance on brute force and finds in the torch and the sword, in assassination and massacre, the real instruments of progress?

Let us not forget 1776 in 1915.

Quakers of New England.
(From The Springfield Republican.)
A perfect example of an organization's holding its own, at least so far as numbers are concerned, is afforded by the New England Society of Friends, which held its yearly meeting at Providence the last week. Additions to membership during the year were 133 and losses 132. There was a net gain of one member, which makes the total 4,011. The New England yearly meeting has an honorable tradition behind it, dating back to 1661. Professor Rufus M. Jones, who has written a very attractive history of the American Quakers, says that by 1743 the New England yearly meeting at Newport was attended by as many as 3,000 persons, who came from places as far distant as Maine and Long Island. Western Maine, next to Rhode Island, has been the important New England centre of the Quakers, and the quarterly organizations are still continued in a number of Maine districts. The religious life of the Quakers has been largely absorbed in that of the other churches, but worship is still held at Providence and some other New England towns. One question that came up for discussion at the yearly meeting was the retention or abolition of co-education at Moses Brown School, Providence. The question was not settled. The other educational institution controlled by the Society of Friends is Oak Grove Seminary, at Vassalboro, Me.

Tiny and Neutral.
(From The Dundee Advertiser.)
Liechtenstein, the neutrality of which has been discussed by question and answer in the House of Commons, could do very little even if it threw off its neutrality and actively joined Austria, to which it has certain ties. It has an area of less than sixty square miles, and a population of something like 10,000, but since 1867 the inhabitants have not been liable to military service. The principality, which lies between the Austrian crown land of Vorarlberg and the Swiss cantons of St. Gallen and Graubünden, formed part of the German Confederation from 1815 to 1866, but is now an independent sovereign state, with a hereditary monarch. The postal, telegraphic and telephonic affairs are, however, managed by the Austrian authorities, and it is allied to the Austrian Customs Union.

Take Over Sayville.
To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Kindly bring all the pressure possible through your valuable paper to induce the government to take over the entire charge, supervision and control of the Sayville wireless station. Mr. Metz's threat to bring action against the government carried an unpleasant menace with it. Who is Mr. Metz to take such an attitude toward the government of the United States, when his very name would suggest the wisdom of the supervision so strongly recommended?

A. J. F.
New York, July 2, 1915.

MR. DANIELS'S UNIVERSITY

An Innovation That Proves Him an Advocate of Preparedness.
To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: For some time Secretary Daniels has been the target of many papers that think him blindly infatuated with pacifism. That he is not is indicated by his actions and by his utterances, two of which latter no less ardent an advocate of preparedness than the National Security League has quoted in a recent leaflet entitled "Why We Are Not Prepared for War."
You seem to have hit upon the cause of the discontent. In a recent editorial entitled "Daniels Should Go as Well as Bryan" you assail him because "he has devoted more time and energy to making the navy 'an institution of learning'—a sort of high school for the enlisted man—than he has to making it a highly tempered military instrument." Further down you say: "He is not in sympathy with any programme which looks to the subordination of the fads and fancies of his educational scheme to genuine military efficiency."
It is true that according to old standards the purpose of an education is to produce a school teacher, a minister, a physician or a lawyer, and likewise in the navy to make a sailor and in the army a soldier. But let us remember that the foundations of all theories are crumbling every day and that indications are not lacking that reforms are needed in our military establishment.
What would you think of a system that would have pupils alternate a week in school and a week in the shop for two years and students spend their time in the same way for five years? Does not this seem an educational heresy? Yet this has been an accomplished fact in Fitchburg for the last nine years. You can find the same system in Dayton, Ohio, and in the University of Cincinnati. And the reform is a great success. You will see it here also. A similar system of dual education prevails in the University of Illinois and others of the same kind, where many students devote a great deal of time to military training and yet rival the other students in learning and achievements.
You are for preparedness. God speed you! Some of the advocates of preparedness want a reserve army of 300,000, or 500,000 or 1,000,000. They demand more draughts, more of every mechanical requisite for the defence of our country. We all feel the need of adequate defences. But where are the men? As it is we lack them. We have a deficit in our paltry army, a deficit in our incomplete navy and a deficit in the national guard, in spite of the fact that our enlisted men enjoy better conditions than those of any other nation. The reason is that our young men are practical. They look to the future.
A young man who has given his best years to the army or to the navy when he leaves the service is in the same condition as the office boy who dropped out of school at an early age and who averages at the age of thirty-two \$10.25 a week. This is our enlisted man's bâton de maréchal. The service has used him during the period of his enlistment for the security of the country and has paid him and kept him healthy, but has done nothing more for his future.
The educational innovation of Secretary Daniels is undoubtedly an endeavor to remedy this evil and to make the service not only useful to the country but profitable for the enlisted servant of the country. No reform can be accomplished without friction, without hurting dear old habits and venerable feelings, thus inevitably bringing about some "demoralization." But when things have been adjusted and this reform will bear its fruit the patriots, those who believe in clear-sighted preparedness, will bless the name of Daniels.
Earnest and energetic efforts toward permanent peace are being made all over the world. Mankind is tired of barbarous hecatombs, of the reckless destruction of all vestiges of civilization. We fervently hope, of course, that this disastrous war will be the last, and that the peace conference will bring about universal disarmament. Should this hope be deceived and the possibility of war continue among nations, then this, the wealthiest country, will find itself more exposed than any other to the dangers of war and invasion. Then either we will have to have conscription or else make the service so attractive that our military establishment will before it is too late be recruited to adequate strength. This latter course may now adopt. And so to do that we must make the school the preparation for the barracks and battleship and the latter the continuation of the school.
This, it seems to me, is precisely what our Secretary of the Navy has the foresight to advocate: that the step from the school to the battleship be made an easy and attractive one, so as to conquer the lamentable aversion to enlistment which prevails among our youth and is a much greater danger to our security than insufficiency of draughts.

N. BEHAR.
New York, June 30, 1915.

Our Latest Submarines.
To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I read with interest that the American submarines will be the fastest of all. That may be, but I am sure that it will be due to the fact that the boats will be built on the lines of 1-13, which were rejected by the Germans, who consider always "safety first." The German limit is 1-10, which allows to turn in a circle of five boat's lengths; with 1-13 the agility of the boat is so handicapped that the running ashore business of H.3 and others will happen again and again, not to speak of the ease with which such an unhandy boat could be rammed by any old trawler or bathtub.
It is amusing to read that the 400-ton boats could repeat the same Mediterranean trip of the German boats . . . if "they can keep their engines turning." That's just it. If they can do it; that's the crux.
The Germans have been ridiculed time and again (by the competitors of Krupp, well understood) for building just the type of boats they did, but facts have borne out. I think they knew fairly well what they were doing. A big boat has undeniably smoother rolling and pitching than a small boat, and thereby makes life less strenuous to the crew, even if otherwise the inner space and comfort are not much increased.
When I came over to the States in 1913 a big boom was made of "the biggest submarine of the world" being launched at the Pacific Coast, a boat of 850 tons submerged, and I had to smile when thinking that I saw the Archimedes maneuvering at Cherbourg just when we left the harbor; and that submarine has 1,100 tons. Yet this is not the biggest by far; the Russians have a boat of more than 4,000 tons under way, and it will take some time before it is finished.
When a submarine is built one has to consider the narrow working room available in such boats, so that only a few men at a time are able to move about and handle their tools. And when you read that a submarine takes five months to be ready to take to sea, under the circumstances, you may admire your tank-fighter with a lonely tear of pride and thank down upon whom it took from eighteen to twenty-two weary months to see one get ready under his eyes. I know of fourteen submarines needing that time and more.

ONE WHO KNOWS.
New York, July 2, 1915.



ENGLAND AND GERMANY

Some Reasons for the Partiality of American Sympathy.
To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: In your issue of to-day John V. Rowland asks certain questions in regard to the attitude of England toward this country at the time of the Civil War. Whatever defence might be made of England in this connection, it does not seem to me that Mr. Rowland's "indictment of England" has weight as applied to the present European war. The responsibility for this war and the odium attached to the methods of its waging rest entirely on the nation or nations that, both positively and negatively, made such a thing possible at a time when the world had good reasons, apparently, to hope that such a terrible reversion to barbarism could not happen.
I would ask Mr. Rowland if he thinks, in the light (or the darkness) of the tremendous weight of evidence against Germany, that she would hesitate to injure this or any other country in any conceivable way that Germany might think necessary? What reason has Mr. Rowland to think so? Is the Lusitania a case in point?
I also should like to ask some questions: Where was the blood, whose the principles, whose the spirit, that linked in spiritual kinship the signers of the Declaration of Independence with the signers of Magna Charta? ENGLAND'S.
Against whom did the English-American patriots wage the war of independence? AGAINST THE GERMAN FAMILY AND INFLUENCE AND SPIRIT THEN ENTHRONED IN ENGLAND.
Where did George Washington and all the other fathers and founders of this Republic get the blood and the spirit that enabled them to do what they did, and which has handed down to us the splendid inheritance that will make us proud and grateful on this coming Fourth of July? FROM ENGLAND.
Who, of all the more powerful nations of Europe, was the only one friendly toward this country during the war with Spain? ENGLAND.
Whose naval commander, in contrast to Germany's ill disguised hostility, clearly showed his friendship at Manila Bay? ENGLAND'S.
Who only among the warring nations has in cold blood and by premeditation slaughtered the citizens of neutral countries, including women and children? Who has made war more like hell than ever? GERMANY.
Against whose brand of Kultur, whose type of government, whose ruthlessly brutal military methods, whose whole system and spirit has the United States most need to arm and be prepared? GERMANY'S.
Whose university professors, historians, newspapers, official spokesmen, have so brutally and frankly and openly expressed themselves about war and native ambitions during the last twenty years as to keep the whole of Europe in the condition of an armed camp, and more than any other nation has kept alive the warlike spirit? GERMANY.
Who alone could have prevented this war by consenting to arbitration? Upon whom depended the final cast of the die? GERMANY.
Every nation in the world might be indicted for something at some time. Upon whom now rests indictment for the crime of all the ages? GERMANY.
WILLIAM HENDERSON WATTS,
Son of a veteran of the "Maryland Line,"
C. S. A.
Haledon, N. J., July 1, 1915.

Sir Roger Casement, Patriot.
To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: In a letter appearing in to-day's Tribune, the writer of which prefers to remain anonymous, occasion is taken to cast odium on the name of Sir Roger Casement. "It is understood" by the bashful scribe that Sir Roger is in receipt of a salary from the German government. No proof is put forward in support of the statement, which is absolutely libellous and false. The rumor was one of many originating in London, cable to America and prominently displayed in the Anglo-American press. No means have been spared to besmirch the character of this patriotic Irish-

MAINTAINING O'HEREDWARD.

New York, July 2, 1915.

Minority Rule.
To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: One of your correspondents claims that the fact the majority of women are not in favor of the vote should have no effect on the decision. We are accustomed in a republic to be ruled by the majority. This would be the only exception.
She claims the better property laws and higher education for women were brought about by a small minority of women. Those past middle life will remember the law giving a wife the control of her own property was brought about by the objection of fathers to having their sons-in-law rather than their daughters handle their money.
The first college for women—Vassar—was planned by men. It was claimed then, as it is now, that women must vote to bring about these reforms.

HELEN KENT.
New York, July 2, 1915.

English Humor.
To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: This morning's papers announce that "The London Morning Post" has sent a telegram to Grand Duke Nicholas congratulating him upon his campaign in Galicia, from which his armies have just been driven by the Germans. This is the finest flower which English humor has produced in a long time, and is worthy to rank with Russia's little joke, "Berlin in three weeks," which we heard so often in the beginning of the war. I wonder if the Grand Duke when von Hindenburg smashed his armies at Tannenberg. In case the Germans ever should be driven out of France and Belgium (which, of course, is highly improbable) will some Turkish newspaper, let us say, will some sufficient sense of humor to felicitate the German General Staff on such a brilliant feat of arms?

BENEDICT PRIETH.
Newark, N. J., June 30, 1915.

Advice to the Administration.
To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I think the following to be good advice to the administration at the present time:
Talk softly, but carry a big stick. Don't put up a big "holler" and go armed with a paper pad.

W. E.
Walton, N. Y., June 30, 1915.

MAINTAINING O'HEREDWARD.

New York, July 2, 1915.

Aiding the Antis.
Mr. Stimson's Arguments Seem Bromidic to a Suffragist.
To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Mr. Henry L. Stimson has emerged to render aid and comfort to the retreating forces of the anti-suffragists.
All the bromides have been resuscitated and spread over the printed page in elegant and subtle phrases. If it were possible to make a case for the anti-suffragists it is clear that Mr. Stimson is the man for the job.
In Mr. Stimson's opinion suffrage is not a natural right. He believes the right to life, liberty and property are natural rights. It is an axiom of modern political thought that men instituted the suffrage to insure protection to life, liberty and property. If this be true, on what grounds can the vote be denied to woman, who has the same life, liberty and property to protect?
He adds: "If it were possible to conceive that the general interests of men and women as classes should diverge in the same way as different classes of men do diverge the same arguments which were used to support manhood could likewise be fairly used to support woman suffrage."
Their interests certainly do diverge and the same arguments are in constant use. To wit, the interests of a class are better taken care of when represented by one of themselves than by one of another class, no matter how able or altruistic that other may be. In other words, "no class has been able to legislate justly, continuously, for any other class, and the history of men as a class legislating for women as a class is no exception to this universal rule."
Mr. Stimson also believes that "to assume woman's interests as a class do, or in the future will, diverge from those of man is to challenge the fundamental assumption upon which modern civilization rests, the unity of interest of the family."
Woman's chief interests are safeguarding the essentials of the home. In our grandmother's day those essentials were controlled within her own four walls. They are now controlled by the government. For any person to imply that an intelligent interest in the government which controls the family is so far fetched as to render null and void not only that particular argument but every other the person using it is likely to make.
Mr. Stimson ends his long brief with this summary. He is opposed to woman suffrage because:
First—"It is not needed to right any substantial grievance or wrong in woman's present condition."
The opinion of hundreds of thousands of women to the contrary is, of course, irrelevant and immaterial. Moreover, women comprise one-third of the direct taxpayers of this state. If working women are included, and they are just as truly taxpayers as Astor, the number is more than one-half. To be denied a voice in the levying and distribution of the tax money has been considered a "just grievance" by English speaking people for many hundreds of years.
Second—"By introducing a large element of voters into the electorate who are entirely devoid of business training and experience it would tend toward an inefficient government when efficiency is most needed."
Women have been studying civics and industrial problems in their clubs for two generations. They are a tremendous factor in industrial and business life, and it is conceded that when they are given the vote they will be the best educated class ever enfranchised in the history of the world.
Third—"Because it would tend to throw a disproportionate amount of political influence and power into certain localities and classes of citizens of the state as against other localities and classes."
If the cities were in a position to oppress the government of rural communities this argument might have weight. To date it has worked just the other way. Legislators from upstate have managed affairs so adroitly that New York City pays the maximum of taxes and gets the minimum of services. If woman suffrage would tend to decrease the tax rate through increased representation in New York it would have one more argument in its favor.

SARA M'PIKE.
New York, July 2, 1915.